Mossage sent to the following recipients: Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell Federal Communications Commissioner Martin Federal Communications Commissioner Copps Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein Docket 96-15 FCC Official Comments FCC Information
Message text follows:

September 22, 2003

[rempient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSL File No. L-00-72.

BEETHER RESERVE TO THE PORM

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I so not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits that" charge for wireless phones?

Sharerery,

;ennifer patin

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 46-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Shawn Mack Mack SMG 206 Central Skokie Rd Lake Bluff, IL 60044-1735

September 21, 2003

[rempient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSC File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits it" charge for wireless phones?

Binnerely,

Shawn Mack Mack SMC



Mossage sent to the following recipients:
Fodoral Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Fodoral Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 46-4° ECC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

joe comrace
col
simkrist@tiadon.com
403 gult
lamar, MO 64759-1290

September 21, 2003

[redipient address was inserted here]

Dear (recipient name was inserted here),

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

The state of the s

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the ECC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month remardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" sharge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

CE conface C. Sinkrist@tiadon.com Me-hage sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Pederal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Jasor Green 29rh Messer Road Villese, NC 28690-9558

Seglember 20, 2003

[recapient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Hocket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

And the state of t

! am apposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and 1 no not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits #21" Tharge for wireless phones?

son erely,

Talin Green

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Dorket 66-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Mar new Barrkewicz 32: Nain St. Por Mormouth, NJ 07758-1041

September 20, 2003

[re speent address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSC File No. \pm -00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I so not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pair of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits there for wireless phones?

iin ∈rely,

Matthew Bartkewicz

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Fixeral Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

chur es Librne 1008 stockslager rd oakland, MD 21550-7645 RECEIVED & INSPECTED

NOV 0 & 2003

FCC - MAILROOM

September 20, 2003

[retipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSL File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket in ome tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a cark of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits" tharge for wireless phones?

Simmerely.

Charles Thorne

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Do k t Go-4° FCC Official Comments
1 O Intermation
Message text follows:

Douglas Derstine 2504 creekside dr Lansdale, PA 19446-7405 FCC-MAILEDOM

September 20, 2003

[resipient address was inserted here]

Dear (recipient name was inserted here),

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The OSF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a paik of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits a the charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Doug Derstine

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
tederal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Foliated Communications Commissioner Adelstein
DC KOL 16-45 ECC Official Comments
ECC Information.
Message text follows:

Kevin Brown 32. S. Spring Ave. Sioux Falls, SD 57104-3629 RECEIVED & INSPECTED
NOV 0 6 2003
FGC - MAILROOM

September 18, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dour [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSU tile No L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to scrools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits but" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Kewin Brown

Message sent to the following recipients: Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell Federal Communications Commissioner Martin Fideral Communications Commissioner Copps Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy Fineral Communications Commissioner Adelstein Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments FCC Information Message text follows:

Tunia Smith 132 Carolina Lake Drive #306 Day ona Beach, FL 32114-7473

3eol∈mb∈r ι7, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits al!" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Brirson Smith

BECEIVED & INSPECTED

NOV 0 6 2003

FCC - MAILROOM

Mossage sent to the following recipients:
Faderal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Faderal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Faderal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Dorket 96-45 FCC Official Comments

100 Information
Message text follows:

Ned Humphrey
Managing Editor
808 Saint Paul Stroet
Ball more, MD 21202-2406



September 17, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and N3D File No. L-00-72.

I am apposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the ECC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits a.." Tharge for wireless phones?

3 eleiy,

Ned Humphrey Managing Editor Message sent to the following recipients. Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell Federal Communications Commissioner Martin Federal Communications Commissioner Copps Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein Do kc: 96-45 FCC Official Comments Figure Information
Mainuse text follows:



Kyl⇔ Thambers 3 T..ff∈ Hill Ct. Potomac, MD 20854-2945

September 17, 2003

[relipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recapient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was apdated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I no not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pair of our and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits" trarge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Kyla Chambers

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docker 96-45 FCC Official Comments
LTC Information
Message text follows

Catherine Prahl 1201 Connecticut Ave NW #250 Washington, DC 20036-2635

September 17, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Doir [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.


I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nordiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Catherine Prahl



Message sent to the following recipients:
Faxeral Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Friend Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 46-45 FCC Official Comments
E. 3 Information
Message text follows:

Judy Steckel
IT Specialist

NUV U n 2001
FCC - MAILROOM

Saptember 11, 2003

9453 Gentle Circle

r= prest address was inserted here]

Montgomery Village, MD 20886-1208

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-/2.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the ECC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a cask of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits align" charge for wireless phones?

sincerely,

Judy Steckel IT Openialist Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 ECC Official Comments
ECC Information
Message text follows:

' . Ceasar h' . Surrey Square Lane Co-crist Heights, MD 20747-2995 NU / N & 2003 FOC - MAILROOM

Seplember 10, 2003

[rel.pient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

C) Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NEU File No. L-00-72.

1 am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and to not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits bill" Tharge for wireless phones?

Sur Prely.

J A Ceasar

Massage sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments

"Communication

May Dw bb.4 Burnside Drive Apt 1 Rockville, MD 20853-2461 RECEIVED & INSPECTED

NOV 0 & 2007

FCC - MAILFOOM

September 10, 2003

[run.pient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

or Booket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSC File No. L-00-72

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I no not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pair of qum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits ali" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

May Yow

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Locket 90-45 FCC Official Comments

- Confidention
Martine text follows:

FCC-MAILROOM

lyrr pempon1
16.7 prisbane st
silver spring, MD 20902-3903

Saprember LO, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Doar [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Jocket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits it charge for wireless phones?

Surcerely,

Lyrn Pomponi

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Fideral Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Do Ket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows

Anacla Douglas 1170' Kimberly Woods Lane Ft. Washington, MD 20744-5919 FCC - MAILROOM

September 10, 2003

Incomplete address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and N3E File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ab. Ity for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USE was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits a";" charge for wireless phones?

Sinterely,

andela Douglas

Mossage sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Terry B. Thomas President 11.02 Barnaby Terrace, SE Washington, DC 20032-4301 RECEIVED & INSPECTED

NOV 0 & 2009

FCC - MAILROOM

5-4 t+mber 10, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and N3D File No L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month rejardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Janterely,

Terry B Thomas, PhD, LNHA

Message sent to the following recipients: Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell Federal Communications Commissioner Martin Federal Communications Commissioner Copps Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments ECC Information
Message text follows:

Tr-meand Joffries Wir Ford Street SE Washing on, DC 20020-/947

Sept mber 10, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

Co Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSC Die No. L-00-72.

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

6 14 0 8 2003

FCC - MAILROOM

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the ECC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and iow-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I to not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits ali" tharge for wireless phones?

in erely.

Trameece Jeffries

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
act Information
Message text follows:

Artherver Traser 3470 Toledo Terrace, #625 Hyantsville, MD 20782-1336

Softember 10, 2003

[resuprent address was inserted here]

Deat [recipient name was inserted here],

CC) caket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

FCC MAIL POOM

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USE was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and isw-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I so not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a paik of gum and ar automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits" harde for wireless phones?

5 Kerely,

Arthienyer L. Fraser

Mossage sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Pocket Go-45 ECC Official Comments
F I Information
Message text follows:

Gary Flinchum 108lo Weeping Willow Lane Bol sville, MD 20005-3824 FCG - MAILROOM

Sap'-mber 10, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSP File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USE was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits air" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Gary Flinchum

Message sent to the following recipients: Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell Federal Communications Commissioner Martin Federal Communications Commissioner Copps Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein Dock t 96-45 FCC Official Comments ECC Information Message text follows:

Toll VanderStaas 338 Mear.der Dr. Bullhead City, AZ 86442-4741 RECEIVED & INSPECTED |
1001 OF G 7003
FCC - MAILROOM

Bastember 10, 2003

[rea.prent address was inserted here]

Doar [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Ducket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD rule No L-00-72.

I im opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Jun ∈rely,

led VanderStaay

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Foderal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows.

Diane Atkinson 111/ Southview Drive #101 Oxon dill, MD 20745-3422 NU / 6 & 2003 FCC - MAIL ROOM

Secrember 13 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

The apposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits ali" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

lare Atkinson

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

THI MARASIGAN

77:4 SO TROY ST

ARLINGTON, VA 22206-2913



Sertember 10, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

Of Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSU File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month rejardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits al!" Tharge for wireless phones?

in elem,

CHJ MARASIGAN

Message sent to the following recipients.
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell Federal Communications Commissioner Martin Federal Communications Commissioner Copps Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

RECEIVED & INSPECTED
NOT U 6 2003
FCC - MAILROOM

Troy Aroinger 08./0427307-52 Keystone Ave. Chambersburg , PA 17201-3376

September 29, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

OC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSL File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income indiviouals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket intome tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a sak of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits" charge for wireless phones?

Dincerely,

Troy Ardinger 083/01273075

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
For Information
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Message text follows.

April Viswambharan Indiastructure Engineer 2509 Divingstone Lane Vilita, VA 22180-7260 RECEIVED % INSPECTED (

FCC - MAILEOOM

Secrember 10, 2003

[rocipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and N3D File No L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 per month for all wireless phones will greatly increase the cost of cell phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford my wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. The current contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits ail" tharge for wireless phones?

Suncerely,

A ... "iswambharan infrastructure Engineer Mossine sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Fideral Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Feirlal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Triormation
Message text follows.

Jannifer Nordheimer 7001 Carmichael Avenue Bethesda, MD 20817-4611 RECEIVED & INSPECTED

NOV 19 6 2003

FCC - MAILROOM

Segtomber 29, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

C1 Docket Nos 96-75, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the ECC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and ar automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits ali" charge for wireless phones?

Simple relationships and a second sec

Jehriter Nordheimer